

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

RONALD BRUNELLE, #00913506,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID BEDDINGFIELD, et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:20-cv-199-JDK-JDL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Ronald Brunelle, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice inmate, proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition.

On February 10, 2021, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Tonda Curry, Jeff Haas, Brett Harris, and Cynthia Kent be dismissed with prejudice as both frivolous and for the failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Docket No. 20. Moreover, Judge Love recommended that Plaintiff's remaining claims—concerning his criminal conviction—be dismissed with prejudice until the *Heck* conditions are met. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). The docket reflects that Plaintiff received a copy of the Report on February 24, 2021. Docket No. 21. However, to date, no objections have been filed.

This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not object in the prescribed period. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge’s findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge’s Report are filed, the standard of review is “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law”).

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 20) as the findings of this Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants Curry, Haas, Harris, and Kent are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** as both frivolous and for the failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Further, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s remaining claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** until the *Heck* conditions are met.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **24th** day of **March, 2021**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE